

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The drawing sheets with Figs. 1, 2, and 5 are attached and are being presented as a new drawing sheets to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheet. Figs. 1 and 5 have been amended. The specific change which has been made to Fig. 1 includes the deletion of reference numeral 15 and its corresponding leader line. The specific changes which have been made to Fig. 5 include: (1) Fig. 5 is now a line drawing, (2) reference numerals 312 and 313 and their respective leader lines have been added; (3) reference numerals 310, 311, 314, 316, 318, 320, 322, and 324 and their respective leader lines have been moved; (4) all text has been removed.

Also, the drawing sheet with new Fig. 6 has been added, which finds support, *inter alia*, in the original specification at the paragraph starting at page 8, line 26, and original claims 2 and 3.

**REMARKS**

The Office Action has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 21-23 has been added. Claim 15 has been canceled. Thus, claims 1-14 and 16-23 remain pending and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**Drawings**

The drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because critical features of the elected figure (Fig. 5) are indiscernible and for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims, particularly the "core member having a substantially circular rim" as recited in claim 1, a "plurality of spring members" as recited in claim 2, and a "plurality of O-rings" as recited in claim 3. Fig. 5 is being amended and Fig. 6 is being added to address these informalities. New Fig. 6 has been added solely to expedite prosecution and it is not believed that this drawing is necessary to understand the invention. For at least these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections**

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the phrase "a core member having a substantially circular rim" is unclear. This rejection is traversed for at least the reason that the claim language is clear and definite. For example, it is clear the adjectives "substantially circular" is modifying the term "rim." One with ordinary skill in the art would necessarily conclude, using conventional English usage, that the "rim" is meant to be "substantially circular." It is further clear from claim 1 (as amended) that the core member comprises this particular rim. Accordingly, one with ordinary skill in the art would understand the meaning of the phrase, and a rejection based upon indefiniteness is improper. For at least these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection**

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0023517 ("Ochiai"). The rejection should be withdrawn because Ochiai does not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention.

For example, claim 1 (as amended) recites a core member, a dampening element, at least one spring member, a sleeve, and “a material covering the rim and the at least one dampening element.” Ochiai does not teach this combination of features. In particular, Ochiai merely teaches a weight body W1, a cover member W2 substantially covering the weight body W1, a core metal 11 over the weight body W1 and the cover member W2, and a cover portion 12 that covers the core metal 11. (See Figs. 2-4 of Ochiai.) Even if W1 is interpreted to be the dampening element and W2 is interpreted to be the spring member (as asserted in the Office Action), the core metal 11 and the cover portion 12 (which are two elements) cannot be considered to be the rim, the sleeve, and the material covering the rim and at least one dampening element (which are three elements). Accordingly, Ochiai does not teach or suggest all the features of claim 1.

Claims 2-7 depend from and contain all the features of claim 1, and is allowable therewith for at least the same reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable limitations contained therein.

For at least these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection based are respectfully requested.

#### Conclusion

The present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 3/21/2007

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5582  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Matthew J. Kremer

Howard N. Shipley  
Registration No. 39,370  
  
Matthew J. Kremer  
Registration No. 58,671